

## **REMARKS**

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-12 and 20-37 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 12, 20, 23-26, 33, 35 and 36. No claims are withdrawn, canceled or newly added herein.

### **Statement of Substance of Interview**

[0003] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for Applicant—on April 15, 2009. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner’s willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0004] During the interview, we discussed the proposed claim amendments in light of the references and the current §112 objection. I understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that the proposed amendment to independent claims 1, 12, 20 and 26 are patentably distinguishable over the references of record. Claim 12 stands allowed but objected to under §112. The Examiner tentatively agreed that the proposed amendments overcome the §112 rejection. The Examiner and I discussed the user of “wherein” clauses. The Examiner requested amendments to more positively state the proposed claims amendments. The Examiner indicated that she would need to review the cited art more carefully and possibly conduct another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

**[0005]** Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

### **Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0006]** If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims or the only issues that remain are minor or formal matters, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

**[0007]** Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

**[0008]** Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that "Claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph." Claim 12 are amended herein overcomes the rejection under §112 because Claim 12 as amended is fully supported by the specification as originally filed.

## **Claim Amendments**

**[0009]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 12, 20, 23-26, 33, 35 and 36 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 20 and 26 is found in claim 12 and the section "Exemplary Extended Type Manager", pages 17-23.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under § 112 1<sup>ST</sup> ¶**

[0010] Claims 1-12 and 20-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> ¶. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Furthermore, in light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections because the claims as amended are fully supported by the specification as originally filed.

### **Claim Rejections under § 103**

[0011] Claims 1-11 and 20-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In light of the amendments presented herein and the agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot because the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections passed this Application along to issuance.

[0012] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Muhlestein:** *Muhlestein, et al.*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018765 (published January 23, 2003); and
- **Varian:** *Varian, "Plunging into Pipes"*, Proceedings Share Europe Meeting, Share Europe, CH, 10/07/1991, pp 1087-1110.

## **Overview of the Application**

**[0013]** The Application describes a technology for a data driven command line output within an environment that supports a pipeline of object-based commands. Each object-based command inputs a parseable object for processing and outputs another parseable object for subsequent command processing. The mechanism is operative to direct formatting and subsequent processing of the commands based on a type of the incoming parseable object. Format information is obtained for the type, such as shape, properties to display, and the like. The format information may be specified within an XML-based document. The mechanism utilizes one or more output processing commands, such as format commands, markup commands, convert commands, transform commands, and out commands. These output processing commands may be arranged within the pipeline in various ways to achieve the desired output results. (Application, Abstract).

## **Cited References**

**[0014]** The Examiner cites Muhlestein as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Varian as a secondary reference in the obviousness-based rejections.

### **Muhlestein**

**[0015]** Muhlestein describes a technology for a command line utility that overlays the management infrastructure of an enterprise to provide easier command options for administrators to effectively manage the enterprise. The primary intent of the command line utility is to facilitate management of the environment without requiring administrators to write scripts or navigate a vast schematized enterprise exposed through the management infrastructure. The command line utility provides command options through class aliases that enable the mapping of management queries and operations to a common term or friendly name that can be extended both in an alias file or at run time in the command line. (Muhlestein, Abstract).

### **Varian**

**[0016]** Varian describes literature directed to "The Pipeline Concept"- "A CMS Pipelines Primer" and describes a single command string on a command line within the command line system breaking an existing program into a number of small stages that can be called using a single command string. (Action, p. 7).

## **Obviousness Rejections**

### **Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)**

[0017] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

### **Based upon Muhlestein and Varian**

[0018] The Examiner rejects claims 1-11 and 20-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muhlestein and Varian. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

### **Independent Claim 1**

[0019] Applicant submits that the combination of Muhlestein and Varian does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim as amended. Specifically, amended claim 1 recites the following features which the Examiner has not considered and which Applicant asserts are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the references of record (in part, with emphasis added):

**obtaining a data type for the parseable object and  
extending the parseable object by obtaining properties and  
methods associated with the data type using object  
reflection, the object reflection is implemented without a**

**priori knowledge of parameters**, the object reflection obtains a new data type associated with the PPO from an external source including one or more of, a third party object, a semantic web, and an ontology service

[0020] Muhlestein discusses at paragraph [0011] “The WMI command line utility provides **command options through class aliases** that enable the mapping of queries, WMI operations, and other system inquiries to a common term or friendly name that **can be extended both in an alias file or at run time in the command line.**” However, the discussion in Muhlestein of a “WMI utility... that can be extended both in alias file or at run time in the command line” does not teach or suggest “obtaining a data type for the parseable object and extending the parseable object by obtaining properties and methods associated with the data type using object reflection” and “the object reflection is implemented without a priori knowledge of parameters” and “the object reflection obtains a new data type associated with the PPO from an external source including one or more of, a third party object, a semantic web, and an ontology” as recited in amended claim 1.

[0021] As shown above, the combination of Muhlestein and Varian does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

### Dependent Claims 2-11

[0022] These claims ultimately depend upon amended independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. It is axiomatic that any



dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 20

[0023] Applicant submits that the combination of Muhlestein and Varian does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim, as amended (in part, with emphasis added):

**receiving the parseable object occurs as part of the pipeline entered together as a parseable stream and separated into separate object-based commands**

**obtain a data type for the parseable object using object reflection**

**emit a format object for access by a subsequent object-based command from the plurality of object-based commands, the format object being based on the format information and parameters of object-based commands,**

**terminate the pipeline and deliver a result of the pipeline of object-based commands, the result is delivered according to an output method supported by the computer, the format of the result depends upon whether the output command is preceded by any number of format modifying commands**

[0024] The clarifying features of amended claim 20 are similar to those features of allowable claim 12 which render claim 12 patentably distinct over Muhlestein. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 20 is patentably distinct over Muhlestein because the clarifying features analogous to claim 12 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Muhlestein. The Examiner relied on Varian for

describing “a single command string on a command line within the command line system breaking an existing program into a number of small stages that can be called using a single command string” which does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 20.

**[0025]** Consequently, without each and every element and feature of amended claim 12 disclosed, taught or suggested by the references of record there is no prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that amended claim 20 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of this claim.

#### *Dependent Claims 21-25*

**[0026]** These claims ultimately depend upon amended independent claim 20. As discussed above, claim 20 is in condition for allowance. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

#### *Independent Claim 26*

**[0027]** Applicant submits that the combination of Muhlestein and Varian does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim, as amended (in part, with emphasis added):

**receiving the parseable object occurs as part of the pipeline entered together as a parseable stream and separated into separate object-based commands**

**obtaining a data type for the parseable object and extending the parseable object by obtaining properties and methods associated with the data type using object reflection, the object reflection is implemented without a priori knowledge of parameters**

**executing the output command to manipulate the parseable object and terminate the pipeline and deliver a result of the pipeline of object-based commands, the result is delivered according to an output method supported by the computer, the format of the result depends upon whether the output command is preceded by a format modifying command**

[0028] The clarifying features of amended claim 26 are similar to those features of allowable claim 12 which render claim 12 patentably distinct over Muhlestein. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 26 is patentably distinct over Muhlestein because the clarifying features analogous to claim 12 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Muhlestein. The Examiner relied on Varian for describing "a single command string on a command line within the command line system breaking an existing program into a number of small stages that can be called using a single command string" which does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 26.

[0029] Consequently, without each and every element and feature of amended claim 12 disclosed, taught or suggested by the references of record there is no prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that amended claim 26 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of this claim.

### Dependent Claims 27-37

**[0030]** These claims ultimately depend upon amended independent claim 26. As discussed above, claim 26 is in condition for allowance. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

### **Dependent Claims**

**[0031]** In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

## **Conclusion**

[0032] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

/Jacob S. Scott/ Dated: 2009-04-30  
Jacob S. Scott ([Jake@leehayes.com](mailto:Jake@leehayes.com); (509) 944-4728)  
Registration No. 62,806

Clay Hagler ([Clay@leehayes.com](mailto:Clay@leehayes.com); (509) 944-4723)  
Registration No. 61,804

Customer No. **22801**

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)